

## REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the detailed remarks and analysis. This is a request for continued Examination and is responsive to the final rejection mailed August 8, 2007. Claims 1-3, and 5-17 remain in this application.

Claims 1 and 12 have been amended to clarify that any of the choke orifice, the inlet orifice and the outlet orifice comprises a flow area substantially smaller than any of the plurality of flow passages. Further, claim 9 has been amended to include the limitation that the flow passage comprises a flow area substantially larger than any of choke orifice, the inlet orifice, and the outlet orifice.

Claims 1-3, 5 and 8 were rejected as being anticipated by Eto et al. (U.S. 5,411,385). The Eto et al. reference discloses orifice portions "Of" and "Or" that are within different passage ways that are supplying lubricant to different bearing assemblies. Eto et al. does not disclose two orifices in series, where the orifice includes a substantially smaller flow area than any passage supplying lubricant. Instead, Eto et al. discloses one orifice for each passage. The openings at the ends of each passage to the bearing in Eto et al. are substantially the same size as the passages themselves and therefore cannot meet the claim limitation of an inlet orifice, outlet orifice or a choke orifice with a flow area substantially smaller than any of the passages. Accordingly, Eto et al cannot anticipate claim 1.

Claims 6 and 9-13 were rejected as being obvious over Eto et al. in view of Libis (U.S. 4,173,440). Claim 6 depends from claim 1 that is allowable for the reasons discussed above with regard to claim 1.

Claim 12 requires that the choke orifice, the inlet orifice and the outlet orifice include a flow area substantially smaller than any portion of the primary passage. Accordingly, openings of the passages in Eto et al. cannot be read as meeting the claimed orifice limitations. Accordingly, Eto et al. cannot disclose a choke orifice in series with another orifice.

Claim 9 requires that the flow passage comprise a substantially larger flow area than any of the choke orifice, the inlet orifice and the outlet orifice. Accordingly, Eto et al. does not disclose a choke orifice in series with an inlet orifice as required by claim 9.

Claim 7 was rejected as being obvious over Eto et al. in view of Williams (U.S. 3,260,444). Claims 15, 16 and 17 were rejected as being obvious over Eto et al. in view of Libis. As discussed above, each of these claims depend ultimately from a base claim that requires an

inlet orifice, an outlet orifice and a choke orifice in series with the inlet orifice. Eto et al. does not disclose or suggest these features for the reasons discussed above. The proposed combination does not disclose or suggest these missing features. Applicant therefore requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

Accordingly, the claims are believed in condition for allowance. No additional fees are seen to be required. If any additional fees are due, however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 03-0835, in the name of Carrier Corporation, for any additional fees or credit the account for any overpayment.

Respectfully Submitted,

**CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS, P.C.**

/John M. Siragusa/

John M. Siragusa  
Registration No. 46,174  
400 West Maple Road, Suite 350  
Birmingham, Michigan 48009  
Telephone: (248) 988-8360  
Facsimile: (248) 988-8363

Dated: December 7, 2007